

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of the Application**

This paper is presented in response to the non-final official action dated April 27, 2011, wherein (a) claims 1 and 3-28 were pending, (b) claims 1, 3-7, and 12-14 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Glen, (c) claims 8-10 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Glen and Polichar, (d) claim 11 was rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Glen and Belvedere, (e) claims 15-18 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Fillebrown, (f) claims 19-21 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Glen and DiRe, and (g) claims 22-28 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Glen, DiRe, and Hayduk.

No claims are amended or canceled. Claims 1 and 3-28 remain pending and at issue, with claims 1 and 12 being the only independent claims in the application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The obviousness rejections of claims 1 and 3-28, all based in part on Cooper, are respectfully traversed; reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 12 recite that at least one internal transfer unit is for “selectively passing on the received input signals containing image information to either the first and second outputs or a processing unit.” On page 3, the official action refers to Cooper’s description at paragraph [0056] of a user’s ability to select whether an image is supplied from memory or from a connected video source. The official action alleges that this description from Cooper teaches or suggests the above-referenced element of claims 1 and 12. However, Cooper merely describes a user’s selection of an image source and does not teach or suggest that the user selects between outputs or a processing unit as recited in claims 1 and 12. In particular, the recitations of claims 1 and 12 allow a user to further process image data among the four conversion blocks also recited by claims 1 and 12. Merely selecting among various image sources, as described by Cooper, does not provide the selective

processing capability recited by claims 1 and 12. Thus, Cooper does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, none of Glen, Pilichar, Belvedere, Fillebrown, DiRe, and Hayduk teach or suggest the elements that are missing from Cooper's disclosure, nor are they cited for such teaching or suggestion. Therefore, because the applied art does not show or suggest all the limitations of claims 1 and 12 (and claims 3-11 and 13-28 respectively depending therefrom), these claims are not obvious and an indication to that effect is solicited.

### **III. Conclusion**

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all claims 1 and 3-28 are solicited.

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application toward allowance, he is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

August 19, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew R. Smith

Registration No. 62,162  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 South Wacker Drive  
6300 Willis Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300  
Attorney for Applicant